

ANOLIS DAUDIN, 1802 (REPTILIA): REQUEST FOR THE
DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY
POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 1603

[Note by the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. This was the subject of an application by H. M. Smith (then of *Department of Zoology and Museum of Natural History, University of Illinois, U.S.A.*) and E. E. Williams & J. D. Lazell (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, U.S.A.*) published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 20, pp. 438–439, 1963. Only one comment was received. Members were invited to vote on Voting Paper (65)34 under the Three-Month Rule for or against the proposals set out in that application. At the close of the voting period on 3 January 1966, 20 Commissioners had voted for it, and one, Dr C. W. Sabrosky, against it. In his comments Dr Sabrosky cited several errors and oddities in the application and he urged that it should be redrafted and resubmitted. The matter was therefore re-opened and a number of comments were received. We now publish (1) the comments by Dr Sabrosky on the original application, and (2) a counter proposal to the original application by Dr A. F. Stimson and Dr G. Underwood. R.V.M.]

(1) COMMENT ON THE TYPE SPECIES OF *ANOLIS* DAUDIN, 1802

by Dr C. W. Sabrosky (*Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*)

The application dealing with this case contains so many errors and peculiar situations that I believe it should be resubmitted to the Commission with the following comments:

The oddity of a hyphenated type citation by able nomenclaturist Stejneger caused me to examine the original literature, and the following errors came to light:

Paragraph 2, lines 9–10: *Lacerta bullaris* rests on Catesby's plate 66 (and accompanying brief description), not on plate 55, which is the corn snake [the error is in quoting Brown, 1908, who had the plate number correct].

Paragraph 3, line 3: The 'devious notation' 'type: *bullaris-carolinensis*' is a prejudicial expression that is not borne out in the Stejneger and Barbour Check Lists. It actually appears in all editions as "TYPE: *bullaris* = *carolinensis*." Significantly they used the sign of equality, not a hyphen, and italicised the first name (*bullaris*), but not the second. Examination of their format shows that the non-italicised name was that adopted as valid, and the italicised name was a synonym. Obviously, since *bullaris* is a much older name than *carolinensis*, Stejneger and Barbour could only have meant *bullaris* of Daudin, at least in part. Incidentally, from pencilled notes by Stejneger in the Smithsonian Institution's copy of Boulenger's catalogue of lizards (1885, p. 43), it is obvious that they were following Boulenger in interpreting *bullaris* of Daudin as partly *caroli-*

nensis and partly *chlorocyanus*.

Paragraph 6: It is hard to say that *bullaris* Linnaeus is a 'forgotten' name when it was used repeatedly in the type citations, even though as *bullaris* sensu Daudin.

Paragraph 2: The 1961 Code does not state in so many words that the first selection takes precedence over any other, but it does state the following very clearly in Article 61, lines 8-10: 'The type of any taxon, once fixed in conformity with the provisions of the Code, is not subject to change except by exercise of the plenary powers. . . .' If Stejneger (1904) did fix the type of *Anolis*, then it was not subject to change by Brown (1908).

Discussion

Regardless of errors, and of the citations, devious or otherwise, in the Stejneger and Barbour Check Lists, the base rests ultimately on Daudin, 1802, the original publication of *Anolis*, and Stejneger, 1904.

Daudin presumed to recognise *bullaris* Linnaeus, but his conception was a broad one and included both forms figured by Catesby, no. 66 for *bullaris* Linnaeus and no. 65 for what was later (Voigt, 1832) named *carolinensis*. Stejneger's designation of *bullaris* in 1904 picked an originally included species, and fixed the type as *bullaris* Linnaeus.

Daudin's *bullaris* was not a misidentification but a mixture of true *bullaris* and other forms now known to be distinct species. It cannot then be interpreted as a misidentified type species situation, and the Stejneger and Barbour Check Lists were wrong in so doing. The Smith and Taylor Check List of Mexican lizards (1950) not only continued this error but in addition cited the type as *Anolis bullaris* Daudin (correctly *bullaris* Linnaeus sensu Daudin).

Obviously, the identity of *bullaris* Linnaeus is a critical facet of the problem. I examined Catesby's figure 66, together with Dr James A. Peters, herpetologist at the U.S. National Museum, and it is clearly a specimen of *Anolis*. Even if it could not be recognised to species, it might remain as the type species of the genus, without difficulty; this has been done in other genera! But it is possible to recognise the species with present detailed knowledge of the fauna, even if it were not possible in past times. Underwood & Williams (1959, *Bull. Inst. Jamaica*, Sci. Ser. 9, 48 pp.) have an excellent review of 'The anoline lizards of Jamaica'. Catesby's good coloured figure and description of '*Lacerta viridis jamaicensis*' as a common green Jamaican lizard with reddish throat fan is identifiable as more than 'an act of faith'. Incidentally, I found to my astonishment that there was no mention in this bulletin of *bullaris* Linnaeus, which was originally described from Jamaica; indeed the authors state that the first Jamaican anoline lizard to be described was *Xiphocercus valencienni* by Duméril & Bibron in 1837!

I understand also that there is a possibility that the genus *Anolis* may be divided, on zoological grounds. Current revisers of the genus should certainly be consulted, lest a type fixation at this point fix the name *Anolis* on the smallest or least important section of the genus.

At present, I am unconvinced by the arguments, and believe that the rules could be applied strictly to the present case.